

Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report

NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

July 1, 2016 — June 30, 2021



- Improve the condition of existing housing
- Increase the supply of affordable housing
- Improve access to and stability of affordable housing
- Reduce blight and code violations
- Increase civic engagement and public safety
- Enhance infrastructure and public facilities
- Increase access to jobs, education and other services
- Increase economic opportunities



Community Development Department
300 Monroe Avenue, NW
Grand Rapids, MI 49503



CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS

Federal Fiscal Year 2016

(City Fiscal Year 2017 • July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017)

Presented to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development September 27, 2017
Submitted online via IDIS

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
I. Resources and Investments.....	2
Federal Funds	2
Program Income	2
Location of Expenditures and Geographical Targeting.....	4
Leveraged Funds.....	5
Match Requirements.....	6
Racial and Ethnic Composition of Families Assisted	7
II. Goals and Outcomes – Neighborhood Investment Plan	8
Self-Evaluation	47
III. Affordable Housing.....	49
IV. Homelessness and Other Special Needs (Continuum of Care)	52
V. Public Housing.....	61
VI. Consolidated Program Information – General Activities.....	62
Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing	62
Underserved Needs	64
Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control	64
Reduce Families in Poverty.....	67
Institutional Structure.....	67
Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.....	68
VII. Program Oversight and Monitoring	69
Monitoring of Federal Programs	69
Outreach to Racially and Ethnically Diverse (Minority) and Women Owned Businesses.....	72
Citizen Participation.....	74
VIII. HOME Investment Partnerships Program Grants	76
Results of On-Site Inspections of Affordable Rental Housing	76
Affirmative Marketing Actions for HOME Units	76
Allocation of HOME Funds and HOME Accomplishments.....	77
Attachments – Specific Program Reports	80
A. Community Development Block Grant Supplemental Information	
B. HOME Investment Partnerships Program Supplemental Information	
C. Emergency Solutions Grant - eCart	
D. Summary of Consolidated Plan Projects for FFY 2015 (IDIS C04PR06)	
E. Target Area Map	

The FFY 2016 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) describes the results of activities completed by and through the City of Grand Rapids to accomplish the outcomes identified in the FFY 2016 Annual Action Plan for the period July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017. This is the first report year of the FFY 2016-2020 Consolidated Housing and Community Development (HCD) Plan. Following are notable highlights of the plan:

Neighborhood Investment Plan

The HCD Plan focuses on the Neighborhood Investment Plan, which is comprised of eight (8) outcomes that guide investment of grant funds. Accomplishment of the FFY 2016 Annual Action Plan's proposed outcomes, outputs, and indicators are listed in this report by outcome area and program.

Funding

Overall, funding available to implement the FFY 2016 Annual Action Plan decreased by \$1,090,818 over the prior year due to a reduction in the amount of CDBG Program Income available and a reduction in HOME funds reprogrammed from prior years.

Single-Family Housing

Although the City has experienced a moderate reduction in the amount of foreclosures in recent years, the economic downturn and national housing crisis left a lasting impact on the development of quality affordable single-family housing. The extensive nature of necessary improvements, due to the age of the housing stock and limited access to capital, has created the need for additional development subsidies. Increased construction costs has also affected production.

The City continues to promote affordable single-family housing by partnering with Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs) on single-family acquisition, development, and resale projects. These projects build upon the successful completion of 104 single-family housing projects through the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) 1 and 2, and similar HOME projects undertaken in prior years. The City's Homebuyer Assistance Fund Program continues to provide financial assistance to low-income families purchasing a home.

Homelessness

The demands for emergency and transitional housing are being met, but affordable, permanent housing is still needed. The community's *2015-2017 Action Plan to End Homelessness* recognizes this. The Coalition to End Homelessness, our local Continuum of Care, supports the implementation of the housing-first model across the homeless system. The housing first model emphasizes immediate access to permanent housing through a coordinated, centralized intake, assessment and referral process. Implemented in 2009, households throughout the greater Grand Rapids area can visit or call The Salvation Army, the central intake entity, to obtain assistance with homeless prevention, diversion and re-housing, through referrals to more than 25 agencies and programs across the system.

I. Resources and Investments

This section identifies resources the City was successful in procuring to implement the goals and objectives outlined in the FFY 2016 Annual Action Plan. It identifies the location and targeting of activities and the procedures used by the Community Development Department to monitor performance. Citizen involvement in the development of the Consolidated Plan and this performance report, as well as the institutional structure the City used to carry out its Housing and Community Development Plan, and other various actions and activities undertaken during the reporting period, are also discussed.

Resources identified in the FFY 2016 Housing and Community Development (HCD) Annual Action Plan included formula grants and competitive awards available to the City, the Grand Rapids Housing Commission (GRHC), and for-profit and non-profit housing and community service providers. The following resources were made available within the City of Grand Rapids jurisdiction from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

Federal Funds

During the reporting period, the following funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Bureau of Justice Assistance were made available to the City's Community Development Department to fund the Neighborhood Investment Plan and homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing activities.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program		\$4,500,000
FFY 2016 Entitlement: B-16-MC-26-0019	\$3,445,888	
Program Income	\$250,000	
Reprogrammed from prior grant years	\$804,112	
HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program		\$1,025,529
FFY 2016 Award: M-16-MC-26-0206	\$1,021,091	
Program Income	\$4,438	
Justice Assistance Grant (JAG)		\$72,003
FFY 2015 Award: 2015-DJ-BX-0849		
Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program		\$316,210
FFY 2016 Entitlement: E-16-MC-26-0019		

Program Income

During the reporting period, the City used program income from both HOME and CDBG. The City does not specifically attribute program income to individual projects. Rather, an estimated amount of program income is added to the amount of the entitlement each year, and the total available funding is then allocated to specific projects with no designation of whether it is from the entitlement or program income. As CDBG program income is received during the year it is expended

before drawdowns from the entitlement. HOME program income was expended using the same process until mid-year when HUD requirements changed.

Effective January 3, 2017, the City accumulates HOME program income funds earned during the fiscal year rather than expending them with the next eligible draw. The City then identifies this program income among resources available to carry out its subsequent Annual Action Plan. The program income is committed to specific activities before the entitlement is committed. If a project is funded from both program income and the entitlement, the City expends the program income funds before it draws from the entitlement.

During the reporting period, the City of Grand Rapids did not have program income that went to a revolving fund or came from float-funded activities or the sale of real property.

During the reporting period, the City received a new HUD Lead Hazard Control Program award not covered by this report. Detail regarding this award follows:

- Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Program. During the reporting period, the City began expending \$2,900,000 in grant funds from the HUD Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control. This is a three year grant which began October 17, 2016 with the goal of making 150 homes lead-safe.

Assessment. Overall, funding available to implement the FFY 2016 Annual Action Plan decreased by \$1,090,818 over the prior year due to a reduction in the amount of CDBG Program Income available and a reduction in HOME funds reprogrammed from prior years.

Location of Expenditures and Geographical Targeting

City of Grand Rapids Community Development program funds are used to support low- and moderate-income persons and neighborhoods. The City implements the majority of its housing and community development activities in target areas. The General Target Area (GTA) includes the largest geographic area with access to a broad range of services, including housing programs and legal assistance. Within the GTA are more concentrated areas of focus, known as Specific Target Areas (STAs), with access to major housing rehabilitation, public infrastructure improvements, concentrated code enforcement, crime prevention, and organizing activities.

Geographical Distribution and Location of Investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Funds	Actual Percentage of Allocation
City of Grand Rapids (Citywide)	34%	31.7%
General Target Area	33%	35.3%
Cities of Grand Rapids, Kentwood, and Wyoming	8%	8.5%
Southtown STA	8%	8.5%
Grandville STA	3%	1.1%
Near West Side STA	3%	5.1%
Belknap STA	2%	1.6%
Creston STA	2%	1.7%
Stocking STA	2%	2%
East Hills STA	1%	.8%
Easttown STA	1%	.7%
Garfield Park STA	1%	1.1%
Heritage Hill STA	1%	1%
Midtown STA	1%	.9%

General Target Area (GTA). The GTA was selected using income and housing data, and the boundaries have been adjusted over time as decennial Census data at the block group level becomes available. Within the GTA, at least 51% of the residents have low and moderate incomes. Residents of the GTA have access to a broad range of services, including housing programs and legal assistance. Approximately half of the city's population lives in the GTA.

Specific Target Area (STA). Within the GTA are eleven (11) Specific Target Areas. The STAs are residential neighborhoods where at least 55% of the residents are low- and moderate-income. Residents of the STAs have access to major housing rehabilitation programs, public infrastructure improvements, concentrated code enforcement, and support for neighborhood associations. The majority of housing and community development program funds are spent in these neighborhoods.

City-Wide and External Programming. City-wide and external programming is employed for certain programs and activities which promote the deconcentration of poverty. City-wide services are also

available to income-eligible residents for handicap accessibility and minor home repairs. HOME and ESG funds may be used anywhere in the City, provided they benefit income-eligible persons.

See Attachment D for the City of Grand Rapids Community Development Target Area map.

Leveraged Funds

Federal funds expended during the program year also leveraged additional resources from private, state, and local funding sources.

- Public Housing Operating Support. The Grand Rapids Housing Commission received \$830,123 from the Public Housing Operating Fund.
- Capital Fund Program. The Grand Rapids Housing Commission received \$360,742 from the FFY 2017 Capital Fund Program under the Capital Fund formula.
- Family Self-Sufficiency. The Grand Rapids Housing Commission received a renewal grant for its Family Self-Sufficiency program for \$331,000.
- Section 8. The Grand Rapids Housing Commission (GRHC) received \$21,447,624 for Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers. The GRHC also renewed Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation housing assistance for Verne Barry Place for \$455,211. A Section 8 New Construction subsidy was also received in the amount of \$938,460 for Ransom Tower Apartments, a 153-unit elderly housing project.
- Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG). Heart of West Michigan United Way acted as the fiduciary on behalf of the Continuum of Care for federal ESG funds awarded by the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA). A total of \$291,350 was awarded to The Salvation Army Social Services, which serves as the local Housing Assessment and Resource Agency.
- Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program. The Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) awarded Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) totaling \$6,426,741 to the following proposed projects:

Project	Location	LIHTC Funding Award
Garfield Park Lofts	100 Burton Street SE	\$935,038
Harrison Park Apartments	1400 Alpine Avenue NW	\$1,232,954
501 Eastern	501 Eastern Avenue SE	\$1,481,611
Stockbridge Apartments	420 Stocking Avenue NW	\$1,493,031
St. James Apartments	750, 765, 779 First Street NW	\$1,284,107

- Other Funding. Over \$2.9 million was received by City-funded organizations from state and local government sources not previously mentioned above. A number of

organizations funded by the City of Grand Rapids also obtained private funding to support housing and community development activities. The amount received from private foundations, fundraising efforts, financial institutions and others totaled approximately \$1,015,000.

Assessment. During the program year, the overall leveraged resources above totaling \$34,996,251 were made available for specific housing activities in Grand Rapids. This is an increase from FFY 2015 during which \$26,857,016 was available.

Match Requirements

The HOME program requires a 25% local match. Match is based on HOME expenditures, excluding expenditures for administration and Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) operating support. For FFY 2016, the match requirement was reduced by 100% as Grand Rapids met HUD criteria for severe fiscal distress. For the period of this report, HOME expenditures therefore required no local match. Match from prior years is available to be carried forward to future years from Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) for projects financed with City HOME funds.

HOME Match Summary

Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	\$26,844,023
Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	\$0
Total match available for current Federal fiscal year	\$26,844,023
Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	\$0
Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year	\$26,844,023

The ESG program requires a one-for-one match that was provided by the non-profit agencies receiving ESG funds. The Community Development Block Grant and Justice Assistance Grant program have no match requirements.

Loans and Other Receivables. CDBG loan receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2016 included repayments for the City's Housing Rehabilitation program, as well as a repayment of loans to housing developers. At the end of the fiscal year, there were 474 outstanding loans with balances totaling \$3,417,366.60. There were no outstanding float-funded activities. Also, no parcels acquired or improved with CDBG funds were available for sale.

Lump Sum Agreements. The City of Grand Rapids did not participate in any lump sum agreements during the reporting period.

Racial and Ethnic Composition of Families Assisted

The following table summarizes the demographic makeup of households and persons who received assistance from CDBG, HOME and ESG funded programs during the reporting period:

Race	CDBG		HOME		ESG	
	Households	Persons	Households	Persons	Households	Persons
White	264	65	22	-	-	1,403
Black/African American	623	120	55	-	-	3,355
Asian	4	-	0	-	-	4
American Indian/Alaskan Native	4	2	0	-	-	29
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	-	0	-	-	6
American Indian/Alaskan Native & White	0	-	0	-	-	0
Asian White	0	-	0	-	-	2
Black/African American & White	6	-	5	-	-	22
American Indian/Alaskan Native & Black/African American	1	-	0	-	-	2
Other Multi-Racial	108	32	5	-	-	383
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	-	0	-	-	0
Refused/Missing	0	-	0	-	-	372
Ethnicity						
Hispanic	114	19	7	-	-	48
Non-Hispanic	896	200	80	-	-	5,161
Refused/Missing	0	0	0	-	-	369

II. Goals and Outcomes – Neighborhood Investment Plan

Progress made in carrying out the City’s Strategic plan and Action Plan

The Neighborhood Investment Plan is an outcomes-based strategy used to allocate funds for the CDBG, HOME, and JAG programs. It is comprised of the following eight (8) outcomes that support the Community Development Department’s mission of *Building Great Neighborhoods!*

- Improve the condition of existing housing
- Increase the supply of affordable housing
- Improve access to and stability of affordable housing
- Reduce blight and code violations
- Increase civic engagement and public safety
- Enhance infrastructure and public facilities
- Increase access to jobs, education, and other services
- Increase economic opportunities

Results of the use of JAG funds are not required for this report, but are incorporated as the funds directly support *Outcome 5: Increase civic engagement and public safety*, and the funds are incorporated into the request for proposal process.

Each outcome is listed below with an assessment narrative. Following each narrative are charts providing details of each funded project. Organizations self-report their performance evaluations at the end of the grant year, indicating challenges and actions to be implemented. Some note additional accomplishments not described by the performance indicator.

Outcome 1: Improve the condition of existing housing

This outcome supports the maintenance, repair and improvement of owner- and renter-occupied housing. It also supports efforts to maintain the affordability of the existing housing stock. Programs include, but are not limited to: housing rehabilitation, minor home repair, access modifications, safety improvements, treatment of lead or other home hazards, and energy efficiency improvements.

Awarded: \$1,261,098

Expended: \$1,143,967.28

Assessment: Most programs met or exceeded planned accomplishments.

1-1 Housing Rehabilitation Program City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG Awarded: \$800,000 Expended: \$697,804.36
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate- Income Homeowners	Target Area Citywide
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output: Number of qualifying units repaired in compliance with City Rehabilitation Standards.	50	44
Indicator 1: Number of qualifying units where exterior code violations were corrected.	30	38
Indicator 2: Number of qualifying units made lead safe.	20	19
Indicator 3: Number of qualifying units in which home health and safety hazards other than lead-based paint hazards were remediated.	30	36
Indicator 4: Average cost savings to homeowners compared to a market rate home improvement loan.	\$10,000	\$15,999
Performance Evaluation: Program demand improved over the prior year; however, a significant increase in construction costs resulted in less homes assisted than anticipated. The average cost savings to homeowners when compared to a market rate home improvement loan was significantly higher than the goal.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

1-2 Accessible Housing Services Disability Advocates of Kent County	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG Awarded: \$21,000 Expended: \$21,000
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate- Income Households (People with Physical Disabilities)	Target Area Citywide
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output: Number of housing units provided with an environmental assessment for the purpose of making recommendations for accessibility modifications.		
	28	34
Indicator: Number of people with disabilities who gained one or both of the following benefits: 1) improved access into and out of the unit, 2) improved access within the unit.		
	15	19
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were exceeded.		

1-3 Access Modification Program Home Repair Services of Kent County	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 07/31/2017	Funding Source: CDBG Awarded: \$48,000 Expended: \$48,000
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate- Income Households (People with Physical Disabilities)	Target Area Citywide
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output: Number of housing units made accessible for people with disabilities.		
	14	14
Indicator: Number of people with disabilities who gained one or both of the following benefits: 1) improved access into and out of the unit, 2) improved access within the unit.		
	12	13
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were met or exceeded.		

1-4 Minor Home Repair Program Home Repair Services of Kent County	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 07/31/2017	Funding Source: CDBG Awarded: \$392,098 Expended: \$377,162.92
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate- Income Households	Target Area Citywide
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output: Number of homeowner units in which minor home repairs were completed.		
	455	461
Indicator: Number of housing units where occupants benefit from one or more of the following: 1) correction of a health or safety hazard, 2) improvement in affordability, 3) increase in home security, 4) lengthen the life of the structure.		
	435	438
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were exceeded.		

Outcome 2: Increase the supply of affordable housing

Awarded: \$545,000

Expended: \$34,500

This outcome supports the development of affordable housing through new construction and rehabilitation for both homeowners and renters, including permanent supportive housing.

Note: Actual units produced are not shown in the same year they are planned because:

- 1) Agreements are written for periods of one year or more.
- 2) Agreements often begin after the plan year starts.
- 3) For single-family homes, actual units are reported only when houses are completed, sold and occupied.

To view housing accomplishments as of June 30, 2016 with previous years' funding, refer to *Section VIII. HOME Investment Partnerships Program Grants / Allocation of HOME funds and HOME Accomplishments.*

Assessment: One multi-family rental development project did not move forward, and funds were reprogrammed as part of the FY 2018 Annual Action Plan. Other projects are progressing as planned.

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

2-1 Building Blocks Strategy Habitat for Humanity of Kent County	Project Period 02/01/2017 – 10/31/2018	Funding Source: HOME Awarded: \$180,000 Expended: \$0
	Planned Beneficiaries Low-Income Households	Project Location Near West Side
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output: Number of affordable Homeowner units created.		
	4	0
Indicator 1: Number of homeowner units newly constructed to applicable building code standards.		
	4	0
Indicator 2: Number of homeowner units that meet one or more of the following standards: 1) air infiltration rates were reduced by 20%, 2) eligibility for LEED certification, 3) attained a HERS rating of 4 stars (rehabilitation) or 5 stars (new construction), 4) Michigan Energy Code Compliance.		
	4	0
Indicator 4: Number of homeowner units that remain affordable for lower-income families for one of the following periods: five (5) years, ten (10) years, fifteen (15) years.		
	4	0
Performance Evaluation: Construction is underway and scheduled for completion during the winter of 2017.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

2-2 Eastern Village LINC Community Revitalization	Project Period N/A	Funding Source: HOME Awarded: \$250,000 Expended: \$0
	Planned Beneficiaries Low-Income Households	Project Location Southtown
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output: Number of affordable rental units created.	72	0
Indicator 1: Number of rental units newly constructed to applicable building code standards.	72	0
Indicator 2: Number of housing units that meet one or more of the following standards: 1) air infiltration rates were reduced by 20%, 2) eligibility for LEED certification, 3) attained a HERS rating of 4 stars (rehabilitation) or 5 stars (new construction), 4) Michigan Energy Code Compliance.	72	0
Indicator 3: Number of rental units that remain affordable for lower-income families for one of the following periods: five (5) years, ten (10) years, fifteen (15) years.	72	0
Performance Evaluation: This project did not move forward. Funds were reprogrammed as part of the FY 2018 Annual Action Plan.		

2-3 CHDO Operating Support New Development Corporation	Project Period 07/01/2016-06/30/2017	Funding Source: HOME Awarded: \$25,000 Expended: \$25,000
	Planned Beneficiaries Low-Income Households	Project Location Belknap, Creston, Stocking
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output: Number of affordable homeowner units created.	N/A	N/A
Funding will be used to support HOME-assisted housing development activities.	N/A	N/A
Performance Evaluation: Not Applicable		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

2-4 North End Workforce Housing/ ADR New Development Corporation	Project Period 12/15/2016-06/14/2018	Funding Source: HOME Awarded: \$90,000 Expended: \$9,500
	Planned Beneficiaries Low-Income Households	Project Location Belknap, Creston, Stocking
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output: Number of affordable homeowner units created.		
	1	0
Indicator 1: Number of homeowner units substantially rehabilitated to applicable building code.		
	1	0
Indicator 2: Number of housing units that meet one or more of the following standards: 1) air infiltration rates were reduced by 20%, 2) eligibility for LEED certification, 3) attained a HERS rating of 4 stars (rehabilitation) or 5 stars (new construction), 4) Michigan Energy Code Compliance.		
	1	0
Indicator 3: Number of homeowner units that remain affordable for lower-income families for one of the following periods: five (5) years, ten (10) years, fifteen (15) years.		
	1	0
Performance Evaluation: The property at 1140 Davis Avenue, NW was acquired during the reporting period. Construction is expected to commence during the fall of 2017.		

Outcome 3: Improve access to and stability of affordable housing

Awarded: \$528,973

Expended: \$416,990.65

This outcome supports services that help keep people in their homes or aids them in securing housing of their choice. Services include, but are not limited to: homebuyer down payment assistance, financial counseling and credit repair, mortgage foreclosure intervention, housing education such as tenant rights or pre-purchase counseling, legal assistance for housing matters, interpretation and translation services on housing transactions for non-English speaking residents, and fair housing testing and enforcement.

Assessment: Achievements generally exceeded expectations or will exceed expectations by the end of the period of performance. Funded organizations maintained strong partnerships with agencies and organizations which fostered productive collaboration; a strong referral network to connect individuals with the available resources within the communities that meet their needs; promotion of open, diverse neighborhoods; and greater compliance within the housing industry.

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

3-1 Fair Housing Services Fair Housing Center of West Michigan	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$75,000 Expended: \$75,000
	Planned Beneficiaries GTA Residents	Target Area GTA
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of hours developing, marketing and conducting educational and outreach activities.		
	160	173.5
Indicator 1: Number of people who received fair housing education and outreach.		
	2,000	9,867
Output 2: Number of people who attended a fair housing training.		
	100	116
Indicator 2: Number of people at training who indicated they learned new and relevant information.		
	40	43
Output 3: Number of housing industry professionals who attended a fair housing training.		
	100	233
Indicator 3a: Number of housing industry professionals at training who indicated they learned new and relevant information.		
	75	109
Indicator 3b: Number of housing industry professionals at training who indicated they would modify their business practices following training.		
	75	109
Output 4: Number of housing tests conducted to determine compliance with fair housing laws.		
	50	56
Indicator 4a: Number of housing tests where no evidence of discrimination was found.		
	35	36
Indicator 4b: Number of housing tests where evidence of discrimination was found and resolved in accordance with established criteria.		
	15	20
Performance Evaluation: The Fair Housing Center of West Michigan (FHCWM) worked closely with HUD and the Michigan Department of Civil Rights to develop effective and innovative partnerships to detect and address illegal housing discrimination, particularly working to end practices of systemic discrimination. Low vacancy rates in rental housing and the resurgence of home sales presented challenges and an influx of complaints. The large number of people served with fair housing education and outreach was primarily due to newsletters, large scale events, and speaking opportunities.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

3-2 Housing Assistance Center Legal Aid of Western Michigan	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$75,000 Expended: \$75,000
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate-Income People	Target Area GTA
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving free legal counseling and/or representation.		
	210	201
Indicator 1: Number of people who resolved their housing-related legal matter based on one of the following main benefits:		
1) Avoidance of a housing crisis, 2) Improvement in the quality of the person's housing, 3) Removal of barriers to obtaining or retaining housing, and/or 4) Increased knowledge of the legal system.	180	186
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were mostly met.		

3-3 Short Term Rental Assistance The Salvation Army Social Services	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 12/31/2017	Funding Source: HOME Awarded: \$378,973 Expended: \$266,990.65
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate-Income Households	Project Location Cities of Grand Rapids, Kentwood, and Wyoming
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output: Number of households served with Short Term Rental Assistance up to six (6) months		
	94	72
Indicator: Number of households who have increased accessibility to affordable housing		
	94	72
Performance Evaluation: During the reporting period, 93 households received short-term rental assistance. Of these households, 72 were supported with FFY 2016 funds and 21 were supported with FFY 2015 funds. The FFY 2016 short-term rental assistance program continues through December 31, 2017. By this date, it is anticipated approximately 22 additional households will be served and FFY 2016 funds will be fully expended.		

Outcome 4: Reduce blight and code violations

Awarded: \$1,423,688

Expended: \$1,423,688

This outcome supports the improvement of property values and reduction of blighting influences through code enforcement and clearance of blighted structures or structures in flood-prone areas.

Reported accomplishments may vary based on the needs of the individual neighborhoods, type of service provided, and the length of time required for resolution.

Outcome Assessment: Planned indicators were exceeded.

4-1 Housing Code Enforcement City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG Awarded: \$1,368,688 Expended: \$1,368,688
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods	Target Area GTA
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output: Number of housing, blight, and zoning cases continued or initiated.	6,500	6,700
Indicator 1: Number of housing units brought into compliance with one or more of the following: Property Maintenance Code, Nuisance Code, or Zoning Code.	4,000	4,678
Indicator 2: Number of vacant and/or abandoned housing units returned to productive use.	200	261
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were exceeded.		

4-2 Historic Preservation Code Enforcement City of Grand Rapids Planning Department	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG Awarded: \$55,000 Expended: \$55,000
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods	Target Area GTA
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output: Number of code violation cases continued or initiated.		
	400	417
Indicator: Number of housing units brought into compliance with one or more of the following: Housing Code, Nuisance Code, Zoning Ordinance, or Historic Preservation Standards.		
	350	399
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were exceeded. Historic Preservation Code Enforcement continues to coordinate with neighborhood associations and the Grand Rapids Association of Realtors on public education activities.		

Outcome 5: Increase civic engagement and public safety

Awarded: \$549,613

Expended: \$521,993.99

This outcome supports 1) quality of life and sense of community in neighborhoods by decreasing or preventing crime, and 2) neighborhood leadership and civic engagement as the means to build great neighborhoods. This outcome supports actions to counteract threats to neighborhood stability, promote choice and opportunity, and encourage sustainable change. Programs and services may include, but are not limited to: community organizing, leadership development, referral services, beautification projects, and neighborhood promotion.

Outcome Assessment: Overall, planned indicators varied from actual results. Most projects met or exceeded all goals, although a few projects did not meet planned performance indicators. Projects that did not meet planned indicators were largely due to extended staff vacancies and turnover. Reasons noted for success include volunteers, resident involvement, and strong relationships between property owners, residents, the City, and other organizations.

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-1 Public Safety Baxter Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$37,035 Expended: \$36,361.98
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Southtown
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED).	175	176
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	131	135
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	46	46
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	55	135
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	36	42
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	23	24
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	12	12
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals have been met or exceeded.		

5-2 Neighborhood Leadership and Civic Engagement Creston Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$17,259 Expended: \$13,786.77
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Creston
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	38	34
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills.	29	21
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	30	36
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	3,870	3,870
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	200	102
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	40	37
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	26	31
Performance Evaluation: A prolonged staff vacancy resulted in lower than planned outcomes. Volunteers coordinated events including a pancake breakfast and a perennial exchange to engage neighbors.		

5-3 Public Safety Creston Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$19,870 Expended: \$14,453.28
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Creston
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED).		
	80	21
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.		
	60	15
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.		
	16	19
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.		
	60	21
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.		
	10	5
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.		
	10	7
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.		
	6	6
Performance Evaluation: Performance goals were lower than planned due to a prolonged staff vacancy. Public safety achievements were due largely to volunteer support.		

<p>5-4</p> <p>Neighborhood Leadership and Civic Engagement</p> <p>East Hills Council of Neighbors</p>	<p>Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017</p>	<p>Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$16,291 Expended: \$16,291</p>
	<p>Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood</p>	<p>Target Area East Hills</p>
	<p>Planned Units</p>	<p>Actual Units</p>
<p>Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.</p>	<p>50</p>	<p>195</p>
<p>Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills.</p>	<p>80</p>	<p>120</p>
<p>Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>89</p>
<p>Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.</p>	<p>4,060</p>	<p>4,060</p>
<p>Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.</p>	<p>160</p>	<p>400</p>
<p>Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.</p>	<p>36</p>	<p>40</p>
<p>Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.</p>	<p>18</p>	<p>21</p>
<p>Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were exceeded.</p>		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-5 Public Safety East Hills Council of Neighbors	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: JAG Awarded: \$18,755 Expended: \$18,755
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area East Hills
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED).	100	104
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	85	66
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	15	12
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	60	115
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	15	16
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	6	6
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	4	3
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were nearly met.		

5-6 Neighborhood Leadership and Civic Engagement Eastown Community Association	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$14,447 Expended: \$13,671.63
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Eastown
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	50	240
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills.	45	149
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	50	1,166
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	2,095	2,095
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	225	1,120
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	15	38
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	5	10
Performance Evaluation: All performance measures were exceeded. Residents volunteered at neighborhood clean ups, Picnic in the Park, the Annual Meeting, and the Bizarre Bazaar. Neighborhood surveys were successful and had high levels of participation.		

5-7 Public Safety Easttown Community Association	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$16,631 Expended: \$15,666.71
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Easttown
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED).		
	100	121
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.		
	75	76
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.		
	30	56
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.		
	65	203
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.		
	10	57
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.		
	5	10
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.		
	1	2
Performance Evaluation: All planned performance measures were exceeded. The neighborhood has expanded its public safety mission to include traffic and pedestrian safety.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-8 Neighborhood Leadership and Civic Engagement Garfield Park Neighborhoods Association	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$24,347 Expended: \$24,263.37
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Garfield Park
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	55	357
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	50	49
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	32	205
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	13,795	13,795
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	312	358
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	25	72
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	10	49
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance outcomes were mostly exceeded. Residents became engaged on topics including the Parks Master Plan, the Burton Heights business district, and proposed developments.		

5-9 Public Safety Garfield Park Neighborhoods Association	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$28,030 Expended: \$27,929.59
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Garfield Park
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED).		
	147	237
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.		
	110	96
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.		
	23	247
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.		
	46	106
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.		
	20	147
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.		
	20	16
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.		
	10	8
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance was mostly exceeded. Staff turnover resulted in some reduced outcomes. Success in other areas was achieved through collaborations with partnering organizations and dedicated volunteers.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-10 Neighborhood Leadership and Civic Engagement Heritage Hill Association	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$20,339 Expended: \$20,339
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Heritage Hill
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	50	212
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	35	100
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	60	103
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	10,015	10,015
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	300	359
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	15	15
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	10	10
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were met or exceeded. Land use and major development issues have resulted in large numbers of neighbors engaged in the neighborhood.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-11 Public Safety Heritage Hill Association	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$23,417 Expended: \$23,417
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Heritage Hill
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED).		
	300	303
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.		
	125	193
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.		
	10	10
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.		
	9	37
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.		
	2	2
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.		
	10	10
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.		
	5	4
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were mostly met or exceeded.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-12 Neighborhood Leadership and Civic Engagement LINC Community Revitalization, Inc.	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$49,845 Expended: \$49,845
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Southtown
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	100	100
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills.	90	144
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	100	371
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	16,395	16,395
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	750	801
Performance Evaluation: Planned performance goals were met or exceeded. Residents participated in programs to engage with local government and schools.		

5-13 Neighborhood Leadership and Civic Engagement Midtown Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$17,579 Expended: \$11,776.05
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Midtown
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	69	28
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	55	6
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	46	34
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	4,395	4,395
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	250	199
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	23	4
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	12	3
Performance Evaluation: Some planned performance goals were met although many fell short due to an extended staff vacancy. A strategic communication plan has been established to re-establish connections with residents.		

5-14 Public Safety Midtown Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: JAG Awarded: \$20,239 Expended: \$9,929.91
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Midtown
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED)		
	150	290
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.		
	100	18
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.		
	20	0
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.		
	37	17
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.		
	25	1
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.		
	23	14
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.		
	9	2
Performance Evaluation: Some planned performance goals were met although many fell short due to an extended staff vacancy.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-15 Neighborhood Leadership and Civic Engagement Neighbors of Belknap Lookout	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$15,120 Expended: \$15,120
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Belknap
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	41	157
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	38	157
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	14	33
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	4,010	4,010
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	160	388
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	23	63
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	18	18
Performance Evaluation: Performance goals were met or exceeded. Two dumpster day events and a park clean up resulted in high numbers of residents engaged.		

5-16 Public Safety Neighbors of Belknap Lookout	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$17,407 Expended: \$17,407
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Belknap
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED)		
	92	246
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.		
	69	39
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.		
	9	18
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.		
	28	174
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.		
	5	6
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.		
	6	7
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.		
	4	1
Performance Evaluation: Most performance goals were met or exceeded. National Night Out and Shop with a Hero events were successful.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-17 Neighborhood Leadership and Civic Engagement Roosevelt Park Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$23,804 Expended: \$23,804
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Grandville
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	46	103
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	41	445
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	23	511
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	6,640	6,640
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	138	453
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	206	263
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	104	159
Performance Evaluation: Performance goals were exceeded. The neighborhood partnered with Habitat for Humanity to hold a very successful curb appeal contest.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-18 Public Safety Roosevelt Park Neighborhood Association	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: JAG Awarded: \$27,405 Expended: \$27,405
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Grandville
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED)	138	330
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	104	93
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	46	39
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	46	300
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	23	103
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	23	21
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	9	14
Performance Evaluation: Performance goals were mostly met or exceeded.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-19 Public Safety Seeds of Promise	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$43,600 Expended: \$43,600
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Southtown
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED)		
	215	218
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.		
	160	79
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.		
	55	92
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.		
	55	58
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.		
	40	20
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.		
	30	31
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.		
	15	16
Performance Evaluation: Most performance goals were met or exceeded.		

5-20 Neighborhood Leadership and Civic Engagement South West Area Neighbors dba John Ball Area Neighbors	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$22,116 Expended: \$22,094.70
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Near West Side
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	63	156
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	50	148
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	21	495
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	6,140	6,140
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	264	632
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	47	80
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	45	148
Performance Evaluation: Performance goals were exceeded. A neighborhood cleanup drew over 300 volunteers to pick up litter and clean catch basins.		

5-21 Public Safety South West Area Neighbors dba John Ball Area Neighbors	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$25,462 Expended: \$25,462
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Near West Side
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED)		
	147	289
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.		
	110	118
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.		
	14	43
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.		
	37	267
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.		
	5	20
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.		
	20	39
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.		
	10	43
Performance Evaluation: Performance goals were exceeded. The neighborhood worked with landlords, code enforcement, and the Police Department to resolve public safety issues.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

5-22 Neighborhood Leadership and Civic Engagement West Grand Neighborhood Organization	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$10,135 Expended: \$10,135
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Stocking
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people receiving leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building training.	50	350
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported increased knowledge about leadership, board responsibility, and/or capacity building skills	40	78
Indicator 1b: Number of people who became actively involved in a neighborhood, community, and/or City board or committee.	50	67
Output 2: Number of people who have access to opportunities for volunteering in their neighborhood.	11,835	11,835
Indicator 2: Number of people actively engaged in activities that resulted in an improved neighborhood condition.	250	818
Output 3: Number of property owners contacted to resolve a nuisance and/or exterior housing code violation.	120	101
Indicator 3: Number of properties brought into compliance with nuisance and/or exterior housing code through self-compliance.	80	54
Performance Evaluation: Most performance goals were exceeded. The large number of people trained on safety were due to high turnout at community events. Staff have experienced difficulty in resolving code violations with property owners of vacant or abandoned homes.		

5-23 Public Safety West Grand Neighborhood Organization	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG PS Awarded: \$40,480 Expended: \$40,480
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area Stocking
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of people who received training on personal safety and/or safety design features and practices for their homes (home security survey, CPTED)	195	562
Indicator 1a: Number of people who reported feeling safer in their home and/or community as a result of the training.	150	94
Indicator 1b: Number of housing units that received safety improvements.	24	35
Output 2: Number of people, businesses, or organizations educated on public safety design features and practices for non-residential and public spaces.	70	117
Indicator 2: Number of locations where public safety design features or practices were implemented.	15	28
Output 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) identified in the neighborhood.	40	68
Indicator 3: Number of significant public safety issues (e.g. gangs, drug sales) successfully resolved for at least six (6) months.	20	7
Performance Evaluation: Most performance goals were exceeded. The large number of people trained on safety is due to high turnout at community events. Staff are working on developing more effective processes to survey residents who have been trained. West Grand Neighborhood Organization continues to work with the Grand Rapids Police Department to resolve public safety issues for at least six months.		

Outcome 6: Enhance infrastructure and public facilities

Awarded: \$224,513

Expended: \$0

This outcome enhances publically-owned facilities and infrastructure that improves the community and neighborhoods, such as parks, streets, sidewalks, streetscapes and other public infrastructure and facilities, including improving accessibility to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

Assessment: Specific neighborhood infrastructure projects to be implemented with FY 2017 funds have not yet been identified. During the reporting period, improvements to three (3) parks were completed using prior year funds.

6-1 Neighborhood Infrastructure Program City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department	Project Period TBD	Funding Source: CDBG Awarded: \$224,513 Expended: \$0
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhood	Target Area All STA's
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output: TBD	TBD	TBD
Indicator: TBD	TBD	TBD
Performance Evaluation: Specific neighborhood infrastructure projects to be implemented with FY 2017 funds have not yet been identified. During the reporting period, improvements to three (3) parks were completed using prior year funds.		

Outcome 7: Increase access to jobs, education, and other services

Awarded: \$0

Expended: \$0

This outcome supports increased access to jobs, education, health and wellness, recreation, and health and social service activities.

Assessment: No projects were funded under this outcome for the period of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017.

Outcome 8: Increase economic opportunities

Awarded: \$100,000

Expended: \$84,579.00

This outcome supports enhanced economic stability and prosperity by increasing economic opportunities for residents, through job readiness and skill training, promotion of entrepreneurship (including culturally diverse populations), façade improvements, and other strategies.

Assessment: Outcomes are expected to continue to improve as the programs establish more relationships with other programs and agencies.

8-1 Youth Employment Initiative Hispanic Center of Western Michigan	Project Period 07/01/2016 – 06/30/2017	Funding Source: CDBG Awarded: \$60,000 Expended: \$44,579
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate-Income People	Target Area City of Grand Rapids
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of participants who complete the eight week job readiness program.	30	28
Indicator 1: Number of participants who report feeling more qualified or prepared to enter the workforce or post-secondary education.	24	22
Output 2: Number of participants who complete a paid work experience.	24	26
Indicator 2: Number of participants with a positive reference from their worksite supervisor.	24	30
Output 3: Number of participants who complete an “Employability Skills Development Training.”	24	30
Indicator 3: Number of participants with improved workforce skills.	24	24
Performance Evaluation: Almost all performance goals were met or exceeded.		

GOALS AND OUTCOMES- NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PLAN

8-2 JobStart Steepletown Neighborhood Services	Project Period 07/01/2017 – 06/30/2018	Funding Source: CDBG Awarded; \$40,000 Expended: \$40,000
	Planned Beneficiaries Low- and Moderate- Income People	Target Area City of Grand Rapids
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output 1: Number of participants engaged in a paid work experience.		
	24	10
Output 2: Number of participants who received training on workforce development skills.		
	20	10
Indicator 1: Number of participants who have worked at least 30 consecutive days.		
	12	3
Indicator 2: Number of participants who demonstrated increased development of a work readiness mindset.		
	12	5
Indicator 3: Number of participants who resolved at least three barriers to employment.		
	12	2
Indicator 4: Number of participants who complete a workforce development credential.		
	12	0
Performance Evaluation: Recruiting efforts for program participants were delayed due to limited options for employment opportunities and partnerships. New partnerships and staff dedicated to this program will ensure outcomes are met in FFY 2017.		

Completed Projects from Prior Funding Years – CDBG

It is common for infrastructure-related activities to require more than one (1) year to complete. The following is a summary of CDBG projects funded prior to the FFY 2016 Annual Action Plan that progressed during the reporting period.

6-1 Neighborhood Infrastructure Program City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department	Project Period 4/1/2016 – 12/31/2016	Funding Source: CDBG (FFY 2012 – FFY 2015) Expended: \$925,000
	Planned Beneficiaries Residents of Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods	Target Area All STA's
	Planned Units	Actual Units
Output: Park improvements		
	3	3
Indicator: Number of parks improved		
	3	3
Performance Evaluation: During the reporting period, improvements were completed at Dickinson Buffer, Douglas, and Mary Waters parks.		

Self-Evaluation

This section provides an opportunity to reflect on the year's progress and to answer some important questions. Most of the following questions are recommended by HUD.

Are the grantee's activities and strategies making an impact on identified needs? What indicators would best describe the results?

Housing in Grand Rapids is old, with over 70 percent of the housing in the General Target Area dating pre-1950. Activities to improve housing conditions such as code enforcement, housing rehabilitation, and affordable housing are addressing needs, although the impact is limited by the amount of investment available through CDBG and HOME funds. Geographic targeting also helps keep resources concentrated in areas of most need.

What barriers may have a negative impact on fulfilling the strategies and the overall vision?

- The overall level of Federal entitlement and local funding available has declined significantly over the last decade, while the cost of administering and implementing projects continues to increase.
- The staffing level for grant administration in the Community Development Department has also decreased, as the Department must rely solely on the administrative funds provided through the grant awards.
- While there has been improvement in the economy, unemployment rate, and housing market, significant demand continues for housing services such as rental assistance.

How have some of these barriers been addressed?

- Staff continues to adjust the workload demand with streamlined processes using Administrative Lean tools. During the period of this report, staff continued to use SharePoint, an interactive data management software application, for document management and collaboration with partner organizations. Beginning in FFY 2017, staff are transitioning to a new program, Accela, which will automate the process for partner agencies to submit performance reports, reimbursement requests, and other forms and required reports.
- Staff costs and operating expenses have been reduced to keep administration expenses within budget.
- During a prior reporting period, a consultant engaged by Kent County and the cities of Grand Rapids and Wyoming to study the administration of federal housing and community development programs issued a report recommending possible efficiencies via collaboration. A consultant was engaged to prepare a regional Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan for the three (3) jurisdictions that became effective July 1, 2016.
- Funded organizations have been encouraged to combine resources or seek additional funding from other sources.

Are any activities or types of activities falling behind schedule?

It has been challenging for developers to acquire properties for Acquisition, Rehabilitation, and Resale activities. This is attributed to an improving housing market which increases competition for available property.

Are major goals on target?

Despite many challenges, most goals were met or nearly met.

Are grant disbursements timely?

Grant disbursements are timely, with funds expended within HUD guidelines, and projects reimbursed as funds are requested and approved.

Specify the nature of, and reasons for, any changes in the jurisdiction's program objectives and indications of how the jurisdiction would change its programs as a result of its experiences.

Program objectives are identified in the FFY 2016 – FFY 2020 Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan. The City evaluated these goals as part of developing the current five-year plan that went into effect on July 1, 2016. This plan includes support for projects that encourage the development of mixed-income neighborhoods and projects that improve economic stability and prosperity by increasing economic opportunities. Where appropriate, collaboration among or consolidation of providers of similar services will be encouraged. Subrecipients may also be encouraged to find alternate or supplemental funding.

Assess how the jurisdiction's use of funds, particularly CDBG, addresses the priorities and specific objectives identified in the plan, giving special attention to the highest priority activities identified.

Assessments of individual activities undertaken with CDBG and other funding during the reporting period can be found in the *Goals and Outcomes: Neighborhood Investment Plan* section of this report.

Certifications for Consistency

Certifications for Consistency from organizations that received HUD funds other than those received through the Community Development Department are reviewed for consistency, approved by the City Manager, and returned to the originating party for HUD submission.

Plan Implementation

The FFY 2016 Annual Action Plan was not hindered by action or willful inaction.

III. Affordable Housing

The City is committed to maintaining existing housing as affordable to low- and moderate-income people and to expanding the supply of affordable housing. Activities that support these goals are reported in *Section II. Goals and Outcomes, Outcome 2*. Below is a summary of one year goals identified in the FFY 2016 Annual Action Plan and the outcome of each.

It should be noted actual units produced with HOME funds are not shown in the same year they are planned because:

- 1) Agreements are written for periods of one year or more.
- 2) Agreements often begin after the plan year starts.
- 3) For single-family homes, actual units are reported only when houses are completed, sold and occupied.

To view housing accomplishments as of June 30, 2016 with previous years' funding, refer to *Section VIII. HOME Investment Partnerships Program Grants / Allocation of HOME funds and HOME Accomplishments*.

Number of Households to be Supported	Goal	Actual
Number of homeless to be provided affordable housing units	0	0
Number of non-homeless to be provided affordable housing units	171	72
Number of special-needs to be provided affordable housing units	0	0
Total	171	72

Number of Households Supported Through	Goal	Actual
Rental Assistance	94	72
The Production of New Units	76	0
Rehab of Existing Units	1	0
Acquisition of Existing Units	0	0
Total	171	72

Assessment of the difference between goals and outcomes and problems encountered in meeting these goals.

The above goals reflect Short-Term Rental Assistance (STRA) for 94 households, four (4) new construction units for sale, one (1) single-family housing rehabilitation for resale project, and a 72-unit rental development to be undertaken with HOME funds. As of June 30, 2016, the STRA program had served 72 households with FFY 2016 HOME funds. The FFY 2016 STRA agreement period of performance extends through December 31, 2017, and it is anticipated goals will be met by this date. From July 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016, an additional 21 households were served with STRA using FFY 2015 HOME. During the report period, one (1) property was acquired for resale and construction is underway on four (4) units for sale. Construction on the five (5) units is expected to be complete during the FFY 2017 plan year. The 72-unit rental

development did not move forward as planned. Funds awarded to this project were reallocated as part of the FFY 2017 Annual Action Plan.

Impact of these Outcomes on Future Annual Action Plans

Progress has been made generally as anticipated. Demand for STRA and single-family housing for homeownership remains strong. There is also significant demand for quality affordable rental housing. Continued support for these activities will be considered during development of the FFY 2018 Annual Action Plan.

Number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons served by each activity where information on income by family size is required to determine eligibility.

Number of Persons Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	345	41
Low-income	287	27
Moderate-income	55	4
Total	687	72

Further Actions. In addition to activities undertaken under the FFY 2016 Annual Plan, further efforts were made to promote Affordable Housing activities during the reporting period. These include:

Disposal of City of Grand Rapids Owned Residential Property. During the reporting period, 162 City excess properties were transferred to the Kent County Land Bank Authority (KCLBA). The majority of the properties are considered non-buildable residential property and the most likely disposition is to be transferred to an adjacent owner. It was determined that 27 of the properties met the criteria of size, access and topography for residential housing. The City requires the KCLBA to develop or cause to be developed, housing that is affordable to households earning at or below 100% Area Median Income on those properties.

Acquisition and Transfer of Tax Foreclosed Properties. In 1999, the State of Michigan enacted a new system for the collection of delinquent taxes and disposition of tax reverted property to address redevelopment of urban areas. Under the new process, tax reverted properties are transferred to Michigan counties which are to make them available for public auction each year. Before the first public auction is held, local governments may purchase properties for public purposes at the minimum bid price which includes unpaid taxes, interest, penalties and fees. The City's policy for the "Acquisition and Transfer of Tax Foreclosed Properties Acquired in Accordance with P.A. 123 of 1999" guides the acquisition and disposition of tax foreclosed properties for the public purposes of facilitating public works projects, restoring blighted properties and neighborhoods, and providing for affordable housing. On May 28, 2013, the City Commission approved an amendment to the City's policy to include the Kent County Land Bank Authority (KCLBA) in negotiations that support the goals of the policy. Approved non-profit entities and the KCLBA may request properties in conformance with this policy, provided they demonstrate the public purpose for which the property will be used and that funds necessary to cover all acquisition costs are deposited with the City before the City attempts to purchase the tax foreclosed properties

from the Kent County Treasurer's Office. On June 14, 2016, the City Commission approved the acquisition of 43 tax foreclosed properties to be transferred to the KCLBA in FFY 2016. The KCLBA is required to complete redevelopment, repurpose, or resale of the property in fulfillment of the public purpose within eighteen (18) months of the City's conveyance.

Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT). Enabled by State law, the City Commission provided conditional approval of tax exemption and PILOT for the following projects during the report period:

Project Name	Number of Assisted Units
Grand View Apartments	192 (of 193)
Keeler Flats I & II	132
Seven45 Stocking	49 (of 50)
12 Weston	48
Stockbridge Apartments	64
Harrison Park Family Housing	71

Continuum of Care. The City of Grand Rapids continues to participate in the Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County Continuum of Care (CoC). The CoC has a Permanent Supportive Housing Subcommittee to address housing needs for targeted populations such as people who are homeless, at risk for homelessness, people with disabilities (mental illness, substance addictions, and/or HIV/AIDS), as well as other special populations.

Households and People Assisted with Federal Housing Resources. During the report period, 519 housing units received assistance with housing rehabilitation or repair.

Special Needs Housing. The City continued to provide funding for the housing-related needs of people with disabilities through Home Repair Services' Access Modification Program and Disability Advocates of Kent County's Accessible Housing Services Program. During the reporting period, access modifications were completed on owner- and renter-occupied dwellings through these programs benefiting sixteen (13) people.

Relocation and Real Property Acquisition. During the reporting period, the City's Housing Rehabilitation program did not have any cases where occupants were required to permanently relocate subject to the Uniform Relocation Act and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (URA), as amended. Further, no clients were required to permanently relocate subject to the URA during lead remediation activities. A non-profit developer acquired one (1) parcel for \$29,994.79 for an Acquisition, Development, and Resale project.

IV. Homelessness and Other Special Needs (Continuum of Care)

The Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness (CTEH), the community's Continuum of Care (CoC), continues to build system infrastructure that shifts from managing homelessness to increased access to quality, affordable, permanent housing. CTEH goals include:

- Meet national goals in ending homelessness for veterans, chronically homeless, families, and youth;
- Lay the pathway to end all homelessness across Kent County;
- Position the Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County Continuum of Care as a nationally competitive community;
- Ensure adequate supply of permanent housing resources for targeted populations;
- Ensure high performing programming to support successful exits from homelessness; and
- Support efforts in the community to maintain and increase affordable housing.

Community Development Department staff actively participates in the community planning process for homeless shelter and services. FFY 2016 Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) funds, which included \$292,495 from the City and \$291,350 designated by the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA), were handled through community application processes, with funding recommendations developed by the CTEH Funding Review Panel.

The City of Grand Rapids received \$316,210 for the FFY 2016 (FY 2017) ESG program from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to support homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing activities. The City retained \$23,715 for grant administration.

A portion (\$231,400) of the prevention and rapid re-housing funds (primarily rent assistance) was allocated to a Financial Assistance Fund administered by The Salvation Army. These funds were accessible to qualified homeless service providers that employ the Housing Resource Specialist model of strength-based case management through a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process. Each service provider entered into a MOU with the lead agency, The Salvation Army. The following tables detail the total persons served during the period of this report.

HOMELESSNESS AND OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS (CONTINUUM OF CARE)

Persons Served with Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Funds July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FUND (FAF)

RAPID RE-HOUSING

Number of Persons in Households	
Adults	38
Children	32
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	70

HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION

Number of Persons in Households	
Adults	46
Children	73
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	119

HOUSING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (HAP)

RAPID RE-HOUSING (CATEGORY 1)

Number of Persons in Households	
Adults	3,346
Children	923
Don't Know/Refused/Other	140
Missing Information	10
Total	4,419

HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION (CATEGORY 2)

Number of Persons in Households	
Adults	734
Children	202
Don't Know/Refused/Other	32
Missing Information	2
Total	970

ALL PERSONS SERVED WITH ESG

Number of Persons in Households	
Adults	4,164
Children	1,230
Don't Know/Refused/Other	172
Missing Information	12
Total	5,578

GENDER

Number of Persons in Households	
Male	1,939
Female	3,456
Transgender	7
Don't Know/Refused/Other	6
Missing Information	170
Total	5,578

AGE

Number of Persons in Households	
Under 18	1,230
18-24	824
25 and Over	3,340
Don't Know/Refused/Other	172
Missing Information	12
Total	5,578

Note: The "Missing Information" field denotes the number of individual records in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) for which valid data was not collected and data accuracy is not ensured.

HOMELESSNESS AND OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS (CONTINUUM OF CARE)

SPECIAL POPULATIONS SERVED BY ACTIVITY

Subpopulations	HAP Prevention	HAP Rapid Re-Housing	FAF Prevention	FAF Rapid Re-Housing	Total
Veterans	23	103	0	3	129
Victims of Domestic Violence	224	1,022	7	4	1,257
Elderly	12	55	1	1	69
HIV/AIDS	1	3	0	0	4
Chronically Homeless	0	340	0	6	346
Persons with Disabilities					
Severely Mentally Ill	158	720	5	13	896
Chronic Substance Abuse	7	33	2	3	45
Other Disability	226	1,029	16	12	1,283
Total	651	3,305	31	42	4,029

The Financial Assistance Fund served 69 households (189 people). Of those served, 119 received prevention and 70 received rapid-rehousing financial assistance.

The Housing Assessment Program (HAP), which provides centralized intake, served 5,389 people in households who completed an intake assessment. Of those households assessed, 82 percent met the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) definition of Category 1 - Literally Homeless. Households defined as Category 1 - Literally Homeless lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence. Eighteen (18) percent of households assessed met the definition of Category 2 - Imminent Risk of Homelessness. Households defined as Imminent Risk of Homelessness will imminently lose their primary nighttime residence within 14 days of the application for assistance and lack the resources needed to obtain other permanent housing. For reporting purposes, households defined as Category 1 – Literally Homeless are attributed to Rapid Re-housing activities and those defined as Category 2 – Imminent Risk of Homelessness are attributed to Prevention activities.

Following is a description of progress made toward meeting specific objectives for reducing and ending homelessness by reaching out to persons experiencing homelessness (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs.

The Salvation Army Social Services Housing Assessment Program, which provides a centralized intake program, continues to devote staff to outreach efforts and work with the community's two (2) missions where individuals experiencing homelessness for long periods of time can be reached.

Using HMIS, staff complete assessments of individual strengths and obstacles, while focusing on housing and helping to facilitate contact with housing, employment, and health-related services. Once housing is secured, housing program staff work with participants to maintain housing and reduce barriers that threaten stability. In addition, Arbor Circle, an agency serving homeless and runaway youth, continues to carry out street outreach activities, and has increased staff capacity dedicated to this role. Coordinated Entry uses the Vulnerability Index Service Prioritization Decision

Assistance (VI-SPDAT), which is a nationally recognized tool that assists with the prioritization of clients to receive housing assistance intervention and identification of the type of assistance needed. All homeless households referred through Coordinated Entry complete a VI-SPDAT prior to resource referral. By providing a systematic, consistent assessment to all households, data collected through Coordinated Entry contributes to a greater understanding about the need for prevention and rapid rehousing resources in our community.

How emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of persons experiencing homelessness were addressed.

The CoC prioritized increasing the availability of permanent housing through rapid re-housing, permanent supportive housing, and housing choice vouchers. Emergency shelter beds and transitional housing units are available in the community and supported with funding other than the Continuum of Care and Emergency Solutions Grants Program resources. Emergency shelter and transitional housing programs are encouraged to employ the least restrictive eligibility requirements to prevent large numbers of individuals and families from becoming ineligible. Additionally, transitional housing in the community is designated for special populations (domestic violence survivors and youth) that have demonstrated the greatest benefit from transitional housing options in addition to rapid rehousing. Employing the housing first approach, the CoC seeks to rapidly move persons experiencing homelessness into permanent housing.

How persons experiencing homelessness (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) were assisted in making the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again.

Historically, there have been a low number of local unsheltered homeless households with dependent children. Of the 55 unsheltered households identified during the 2017 point-in-time count, two (2) had dependent children and there were no unsheltered households with only children. Homeless households are encouraged to obtain an assessment and linkage to available services to help resolve the housing crisis through the community's coordinated assessment system. The CoC coordinates with major systems (Community Mental Health, Correctional Facilities, Department of Health and Human Services, health care providers, etc.), which assist with outreach efforts by publicizing the role of the central intake provider and making referrals when appropriate. Outreach staff is strategically placed in the community to ensure households experiencing homelessness are aware of and connected to community resources to end homelessness.

CoC coordinated assessment continues to assess at-risk households with children to prevent homelessness by using available prevention resources, shelter diversion tactics and linkage to mainstream resources to avoid loss of housing. An intake specialist works with each household to create a plan to resolve the housing crisis. The CoC targets prevention and diversion resources to persons most closely matching the current homeless population profile, ensuring

resources are used for those most likely to become homeless. When resources are available, households are referred to a Housing Resource Specialist who assists the family in implementing their plan and linking them to appropriate resources for long-term housing stability. The CoC works collaboratively with mainstream systems (e.g. schools, child protective services and mental health systems) to identify at-risk households and connect them to appropriate prevention resources.

The CoC is committed to expanding permanent supportive housing for the chronically homeless population. Dwelling Place of Grand Rapids Nonprofit Housing Corporation is developing a project to serve families with children that is proposed to include permanent supportive housing for survivors of domestic violence in partnership with the YWCA West Central Michigan. Inner City Christian Federation is developing permanent supportive housing in collaboration with Bethany Christian Services, a youth services and foster care provider, to target youth aging out of foster care. The Woda Group, Inc. is constructing permanent supportive housing for veterans and chronically homeless persons in collaboration with Community Rebuilders, Inc.

As the local Support Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) grantee, Community Rebuilders, Inc. leads the community's effort toward ending veteran homelessness. Community Rebuilders coordinates the master list of veterans known to be homeless, and the agency has secured funds through the Department of Veterans Affairs to house veterans. Third party review is being sought to validate the community has achieved the goal of ending veteran homelessness. This goal is met when 1) all veterans on the master list are connected to a housing resource and have a permanent housing plan, 2) more veterans are housed monthly than the number of newly identified veterans encountering a housing crisis, 3) a coordinated referral and entry system is maintained to ensure veterans experiencing a new housing crisis gain access to services within 21 days, and 4) all veterans in transitional housing programs exit successfully into permanent housing of their choice. Within the CoC, lead agencies are also developing a plan to end chronic homelessness through a community effort.

How low-income individuals and families were assisted in avoiding becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); and, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs.

Homelessness prevention efforts continue to focus largely on access to mainstream resources to assist families with various barriers to permanent housing. Collaboration with mainstream providers such as the Department of Health and Human Services which oversees Temporary Assistant for Needy Families (TANF), the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and Medicaid eligibility, continues to support effective and efficient access to mainstream benefits by eligible participants. The CoC is making substantial strides in securing income and benefits for the most vulnerable citizens by improving implementation of the SSI/SSDI

HOMELESSNESS AND OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS (CONTINUUM OF CARE)

Outreach, Access and Recovery (SOAR) Program. Pine Rest Christian Mental Health Services, as the designated SOAR Lead Agency, coordinates with other service providers through its Street Reach program to ensure those with disabling conditions avoid housing crises. Local housing providers continue to assist participants in establishing links to mainstream resources in order to sustain housing on a long-term basis.

The CoC supports protocols established by the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services to help prevent youth aging out of foster care from being discharged into homelessness. With changes in policy for youth at the state level, greater flexibility ensures youth are not routinely discharged to homelessness. Youth are able to remain in foster care beyond age eighteen, and youth that have aged out of foster care are eligible to return voluntarily if they need additional support.

Since December 2011, network180, the Community Mental Health Authority in Kent County, has been working with the Community Medicine Division at Spectrum Health Systems to implement the Center for Integrative Medicine (CIM). The CIM is designed to provide comprehensive evaluation, intervention and stabilization of physical and behavioral health issues for Spectrum patients who have frequented the emergency room ten or more times in the prior twelve (12) months (approximately 950 patients). Network180 has two (2) staff at the CIM. Program evaluation includes attention to social determinants of health, which includes housing.

The State Mental Health Code (Section 330.1209b) requires the community mental health program, including McKinney-Vento programs, to produce a written plan for community placement and aftercare services, ensuring patients are not discharged into homelessness. The written plan must identify strategies for assuring recipients have access to needed and available supports identified through a needs assessment. Service providers adhere to state and local requirements. The Michigan Department of Corrections identifies stable housing as a critical need for the successful re-entry of released prisoners. Staff from the county correctional facility and the CoC's central intake provider created a protocol for homeless persons who enter and exit the corrections system. The results are evaluated and protocol amended as necessary. CoC staff participate on the Community Re-entry Coordinating Council (CRCC) to maintain links between the two systems and to keep the Council abreast of housing/homeless-related information.

ESG Expenditures for Prevention

Type of Expenditure	Dollar Amount of Expenditures for Program Year 2016 by Grant	
	E-15-MC-26-0019	E-16-MC-26-0019
Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services		
Rental Assistance	\$17,707.18	\$28,530.26
Financial Assistance	\$4,916.00	\$795.00
Services	\$16,710.00	\$23,564.60
Subtotal Prevention	\$39,333.18	\$52,889.86

HOMELESSNESS AND OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS (CONTINUUM OF CARE)

ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

Dollar Amount of Expenditures for Program Year 2016 by Grant		
Type of Expenditure	E-15-MC-26-0019	E-16-MC-26-0019
Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services		
Rental Assistance	\$48,415.27	\$25,598.34
Financial Assistance	\$16,813.69	\$6,193.00
Services	\$14,460.00	\$20,887.40
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing	\$79,688.96	\$52,678.74

ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

No funds were expended on emergency shelter activities during the reporting period.

Other Grant Expenditures

Dollar Amount of Expenditures for Program Year 2016 by Grant		
Type of Expenditure	E-15-MC-26-0019	E-16-MC-26-0019
Administration	\$3,983.10	\$23,029.70

Total ESG Grant Funds

Total ESG Funds Expended	E-15-MC-26-0019	E-16-MC-26-0019
	\$123,005.24	\$128,598.30

Match Source

	E-15-MC-26-0019	E-16-MC-26-0019
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	\$0	\$0
Other Federal Funds	\$0	\$0
State Government	\$0	\$61,132.00
Local Government	\$0	\$0
Private Funds	\$127,500.00	\$140,200.00
Other	\$0	\$0
Fees	\$0	\$0
Program Income	\$0	\$0
Total Match Amount	\$127,500.00	\$201,332.00

Total Funds Expended

Total Expended on ESG Activities	E-15-MC-26-0019	E-16-MC-26-0019
	\$250,505.24	\$329,930.30

Total E-15-MC-26-0019 (only) expended through June 30, 2017

Program Year	Expenditure	Match	Total
FFY 2015	\$319,602.00	\$420,050.00	\$739,652.00
FFY 2016	\$128,598.30	\$201,332.00	\$329,930.30
Total	\$448,200.30	\$621,382.00	\$1,069,582.30

Continuum of Care (CoC) Program

The 2016 Continuum of Care (CoC) process was coordinated by the Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness (CTEH), operating as the local CoC and as the Housing Subcommittee of the Kent County Essential Needs Task Force. The CTEH is led by a Coordinator, whose position is partially funded by Community Development Block Grant funds from the City of Grand Rapids. The CTEH general membership meets bi-monthly, while roundtables, subcommittees and the Steering Committee meet monthly to analyze and create strategies to further implement the goals and objectives of the three-year strategic plan. A comprehensive, on-going planning process is used to involve a broad cross section of stakeholders including housing providers, consumers, government, social services and other key partners.

As part of the comprehensive planning process, housing providers that apply for Continuum of Care (CoC) funds are required to participate in a local application, analysis and review process including both a local application and a HUD application to the CTEH to be reviewed by a local funding review panel. This group is tasked with reviewing all of the applications, scoring them based on criteria identified by the CTEH, and ranking programs for funding allocations.

For the 2016 funding round, the community submitted an application for renewal projects and new projects created through reallocation. The community was awarded \$5,185,822 in renewal projects, \$65,950 for a new project through reallocation, \$160,553 for CoC planning activities, and \$100,000 for HMIS administration activities, for a total of \$5,512,325.

HOMELESSNESS AND OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS (CONTINUUM OF CARE)

HUD Continuum of Care (CoC) Program 2016 Awards		
Sponsor/Program	Type	Award
<i>Community Rebuilders</i> Long-Term Opportunities for Tenancy (LOFT)	PSH	\$123,748
<i>Community Rebuilders</i> HEROES Veteran Housing	PSH	\$130,265
<i>Community Rebuilders</i> Housing Solutions	PSH	\$528,547
<i>Community Rebuilders</i> Keys First	RRH	\$840,930
<i>Community Rebuilders</i> RRH Youth Collaborative	RRH	\$782,976
<i>Grand Rapids Housing Commission</i> Hope Community	RRH	\$159,663
<i>Heart of West Michigan United Way</i> Planning	Planning	\$160,553
<i>Heartside Non-profit Housing Corporation</i> Ferguson Apartments	PSH	\$63,000
<i>Heartside Non-profit Housing Corporation</i> Verne Berry Place	PSH	\$122,500
<i>Heartside Non-profit Housing Corporation</i> Commerce Apartments	PSH	\$212,104
<i>Inner City Christian Federation</i> Rapid Re-Housing Program	RRH	\$82,872
<i>Inner City Christian Federation</i> Permanent Supportive Housing Program	PSH	\$36,251
<i>County of Kent</i> SRA - Community Rebuilders	PSH	\$430,257
<i>County of Kent</i> TRA - Community Rebuilders	PSH	\$894,363
<i>The Salvation Army Booth Family Services</i> Kindred Transitional Housing	RRH	\$150,490
<i>The Salvation Army Booth Family Services</i> Homeless Assistance Program (HAP)	SSO	\$228,488
<i>The Salvation Army Booth Family Services</i> Coordinated Entry	SSO	\$65,950
<i>The Salvation Army Booth Family Services</i> HMIS Dedicated Project	HMIS	\$100,000
<i>YWCA West Central Michigan</i> Project Heal	TH	\$399,368
TOTAL		\$5,512,325

V. Public Housing

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing.

The Grand Rapids Housing Commission (GRHC) is the local public housing authority (PHA). The Housing Commission was established in 1966 as a special purpose body authorized to purchase, acquire, construct, maintain, operate, improve, repair or extend housing facilities and eliminate adverse housing conditions. Funded primarily by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the GRHC is independently administered and governed by a five-member board appointed by the City Manager. The GRHC serves lower-income residents through a diverse portfolio of housing programs.

Public Housing Improvements Supported through the Capital Fund. During the reporting period, the GRHC used Capital Fund monies to facilitate the conversion of Low-Income Public Housing to Project-Based Vouchers under HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program. With two of four developments completing RAD conversion, conversion activities continue to proceed at the Adams Park and Scattered sites public housing developments. Conversion was initiated as early as December 2012, when the GRHC received approval to participate in the RAD program enabling the GRHC to convert the 100-unit Creston Plaza Apartments and 92-unit Campau Commons from the Public Housing Program to the Section 8 Program. Renovation attached to the RAD conversion for the remaining two sites is anticipated to be completed in 2018.

Actions taken to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership.

Resident Participation. Resident Advisory Board members continued to meet and advise the GRHC on matters pertaining to the administration of various housing programs, capital needs, and necessary resident services.

Resident Initiatives. The GRHC provided numerous services and activities to support and encourage Public Housing residents in assuming economic and social self-sufficiency. These activities, which include, but are not limited to, computer training, substance abuse counseling, academic, skill assessment/training and employment programs, and homeownership counseling, take place at various Public Housing sites.

Homeownership Activities. Through collaboration with the Inner City Christian Federation and Habitat for Humanity of Kent County, Inc., the GRHC offers classes and budgeting sessions to improve the ability of low-income families to purchase a home. GRHC residents may purchase a single-family home through the Section 8 Home Ownership Program.

Actions taken to assist troubled PHAs. The GRHC is not designated as troubled.

VI. Consolidated Program Information – General Activities

Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing

Comprehensive Master Plan/Zoning Ordinance. The City’s 2002 Master Plan provides a set of long-range objectives, policies and maps to guide the growth and development of the community. The Master Plan is based on the principles of Smart Growth, with concepts of walkable neighborhoods, transit-oriented centers, mixed-use, housing choices, community character and partnerships. The Master Plan includes a section on “Great Neighborhoods (GN),” which recommends the promotion of a broad range of high quality housing choices through the following actions:

- Maintain and increase the number and variety of housing units (e.g., owner-occupied and rental serving young adults, seniors, low- and moderate-income households, special needs populations, middle- and upper-income households) to meet the diverse needs of existing residents and to attract new residents to the city.
- Allow for new housing products. For example, small-lot single-family housing, site condominiums, live/work units, upper story residences in commercial districts and accessory apartments in single-family neighborhoods where adequate parking can be provided.
- Allow for a range of housing types within all neighborhoods to provide residents the opportunity to progress through various life stages while maintaining their attachment to a particular area of the city.

While the Master Plan serves as a guide for managing change, the City’s Zoning Ordinance is used to implement the Master Plan. In late 2007, the 1969 Grand Rapids Zoning Ordinance was rescinded and a new Zoning Ordinance adopted by the City Commission. It was an outgrowth of the 2002 Master Plan process and a year and a half of citizen input. The new ordinance supports affordable housing in a number of ways.

Residential Neighborhoods. The new Zoning Ordinance supports in-fill housing by permitting new construction on existing lots where the lot width and lot area is similar to the surrounding properties, even where the Zone District may otherwise have higher standards. This minimizes the number of non-buildable lots that can result from demolition. Also, the demolition of a single-family house and the construction of a replacement home on the same site can now be reviewed and approved by staff instead of the Planning Commission. This shortens the approval process by four (4) weeks. Design standards for new construction in residential neighborhoods require that all housing, regardless of whom it serves, is built to the same standards. This ensures that residents of affordable housing are not labeled as “poor people” by their neighbors. These design standards also promote the long-term health and stability of older neighborhoods by preventing disjointed in-fill development. The old ordinance did not require garages and contained requirements for minimum lot sizes. These items were retained in the new ordinance.

Accessory dwelling units can be added to existing single-family properties as a building addition or in a separate building. This encourages the development of small units for single

people and seniors at affordable price points. The new Zoning Ordinance also permits, with Planning Commission approval, residential rehab facilities, foster care homes, Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) units, and shelters in all Mixed-Density Residential Districts across the City, contrary to the old code which only permitted these uses in a few high-density districts concentrated in the central city.

Mixed-Use Commercial Districts. All commercial zone districts now permit and encourage mixed-used development. A wide range of housing opportunities can be developed in these zones, ranging from apartments over storefront businesses, to live-work units, to high density housing near transit nodes. This mix of uses is intended to provide employment and shopping opportunities within a walkable neighborhood, and reduce reliance on automobile usage. Furthermore, mixed-income housing is rewarded with bonus heights and reduced lot area requirements in a number of zone districts. Reduced parking requirements, and opportunities for partial or full waivers of parking, also supports the construction of affordable housing.

Other. Process improvements have been adopted in the new Zoning Ordinance as well. For example, minor variances from the code can often be handled as administrative departures by the Planning staff. This saves lower-income homeowners from the time and expense of a Variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Affordable Housing Advisory Committee Recommendations. During the period of this report, an Affordable Housing Advisory Committee, appointed by the Mayor, recommended the following twelve (12) strategies to support affordable housing that the City Commission will be considering for adoption:

- Establish an affordable housing fund comprised of non-federal local dollars and governance for its use,
- Reduce the Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) fee from 4% to 1% with a 2% contribution to the affordable housing fund,
- Provide incentives for homeownership,
- Provide incentives for small-scale development,
- Review Neighborhood Enterprise Zones to incentivize affordable housing,
- Encourage voluntary equitable development agreements
- Provide density bonus for affordable housing,
- Include an affordable housing prerequisite to receive City tax incentives,
- Allow accessory dwelling units by right,
- Allow non-condo zero-lot-line development,
- Promote mixed housing types, and
- Enact an ordinance regulating residential rental applications and related fees.

Great Housing Strategies: Addressing Current and Future Housing Needs. The City continued implementation of strategies identified in the plan “Great Housing Strategies: Addressing Current and Future Housing Needs.”

Underserved Needs

In 2016, the Community Development Department assembled and submitted to HUD its Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan (HCD Plan), which is a five-year strategy that provides the basis for assessing performance and tracking results in meeting HUD’s three fundamental goals of decent housing, a suitable living environment, and expanded economic opportunities. In the course of developing this Plan, the Community Development Department conducted extensive research to identify priorities for allocating funds and obstacles to addressing underserved needs. Housing priority needs and obstacles to meeting those needs are covered in the Housing Priorities, Strategies and Goals section of the HCD Plan. Non-housing community development priorities, strategies, goals, and obstacles can be reviewed in the Community Development section of the HCD plan.

Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control

City of Grand Rapids Lead Hazard Control Program. In October 2016, the City of Grand Rapids commenced work on a Lead Hazard Control grant that provided \$2,900,000 to make 150 homes lead-safe. Operations continued through September 30, 2019. Since 2003, the City has received seven (7) grants totaling \$19 million to combat childhood lead poisoning. The Lead Hazard Control Program operates in partnership with the following organizations: Kent County Health Department, LINC Community Revitalization, Inc., the Rental Property Owners Association of Kent County, and the Healthy Homes Coalition. All of these organizations are members of the Get the Lead Out! Coalition. The goals of the Lead Hazard Control program are to:

- Train homeowners and tenants how to clean lead dust from their homes.
- Train contractors and landlords in lead-safe work practices.
- Assist Section 3 eligible individuals to obtain certification as lead professionals.
- Make housing units lead-safe.
- Address additional housing-related health issues in units made lead safe.

To date, the program has accomplished the following:

- 1,386 individuals have been trained in lead-safe cleaning methods.
- 1,207 landlords, contractors, and handymen have been trained in lead-safe work practices or as Certified Renovators.
- 99 women, minority, and Section 3 eligible individuals received assistance with obtaining lead professional certification.
- 1,320 homes have been made lead-safe. The program has invested \$14,150,598 in lead remediation repairs to rental and owner-occupied properties, \$10,174,284 of which were Office of Healthy Homes Lead Hazard Control grant funds.

- 55 homes were assessed for additional housing-related health hazards utilizing the Healthy Homes Rating Tool. The Program invested \$117,018 to correct identified non-lead hazards.

It is important to note how much the City's program and Lead Hazard Control programs across the country depend on Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to support lead remediation activities. For example, grants from the HUD Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control require the recipient to match 10% to 25% of the award amount with local funds. Per statute, CDBG funds are considered local funds and are used to meet match requirements.

Get the Lead Out! Coalition. Get The Lead Out! (GTLO!) was conceived in the fall of 2000 by the Community Leadership Institute at Aquinas College as a way to "bring the community together in strategic action that ends childhood lead poisoning in Kent County." This collaborative effort engaged more than twenty (20) organizations, with representation from local government, human services, environmental advocacy, health care, education, child advocacy, housing providers, neighborhood-based organizations, and others. As a result of the success of the program, GTLO! partners formed a non-profit corporation for the purposes of preserving and expanding the work of the collaborative. The Healthy Homes Coalition of West Michigan was formed in 2006 to sustain the work of GTLO! and to link the work on childhood lead poisoning to wider children's environmental health issues related to housing.

Advocacy

- GTLO! continues to track and impact federal, state and local legislation. To date, nine (9) state bills have been signed into law. In addition, the Coalition has engaged local partners in a statewide effort that advocated for a state investment of general fund dollars in lead hazard control. In 2013, a \$1.25 million appropriation was approved. In 2014, that amount was increased to \$1.75 million and that same amount has been included in the State's budget for the subsequent three years (2015-2017). Legislation passed previously addresses the following issues:
 - Withholding of incentive bonuses for Medicaid payment plans not screening at 80%. Plans are not receiving the same level of compensation from the State of Michigan if they are under-performing.
 - Requiring electronic reporting of lab results.
 - Creation of a Childhood Lead Poisoning Commission.
 - Creation of a Lead-Safe Housing Registry.
 - Penalties for landlords who knowingly rent units with lead hazards.
 - Revising the State childhood immunization database to include lead testing data.
 - Requiring lead testing in WIC clinics.
- GTLO! has sought changes to local policy, including amendments to the City's Housing Code that address paint failure, cleanup of paint chips and dust, a prohibition on bare soil surrounding older housing, and requiring lead-safe work practices. The Healthy Homes Coalition was an active member of a local coalition that worked with the City of Grand Rapids to expand the reach of its proactive rental certification inspection program to include single-family rental housing, greatly increasing the reach of this program to promote improved

housing conditions in homes where at-risk children reside. Along with Grand Rapids' Mayor Bliss, Healthy Homes Coalition Executive Director Paul Haan served on the 2016 Michigan Child Lead Poisoning Elimination Board that was created by executive order by and reports to Michigan Governor Snyder. Mr. Haan has been appointed through 2018 to the permanent Commission created by executive order to replace the 2016 Board.

Education and Prevention

- The Healthy Homes Coalition conducts numerous training and professional development opportunities each year. The Healthy Homes Coalition is an associate partner in the national Healthy Homes Training Center (Healthy Housing Solutions) and offers trainings to general practitioners, community health workers, and code enforcement officials in topics including: integrated pest management, lead poisoning prevention, and the *Essentials of Healthy Housing* course. To date, more than 775 professionals have been trained.
- The Healthy Homes Coalition conducts routine community education and outreach activities, such as health fairs, community meetings, and media appearances on childhood lead poisoning, asthma triggers, and other topics related to healthy housing.
- The Healthy Homes Coalition maintains a direct-service program to assist families with assessing their homes and taking corrective action for lead and other children's health hazards. Since 2008, more than 4,500 households have been served through this program.
- The Healthy Homes Coalition is a regional consultant for other communities seeking to deploy healthy housing programs using a community-based, coalition approach. The Healthy Homes Coalition's Executive Director, Paul Haan, co-chaired the Michigan Department of Community Health's Healthy Homes and Lead Poisoning Prevention Advisory Committee, which completed a healthy homes strategic plan for the State of Michigan in 2012.

Other Accomplishments

- Between 2000 and 2014, Kent County experienced a sustained decrease in the number of children with elevated blood lead levels. Since 2000, blood lead levels in Kent County have fallen nearly 92%, from a high of 6.2% of all children tested. In 2014, 48 or 0.5% of all children tested had elevated blood lead levels (≥ 10.0 ug/dL). Meanwhile, testing has increased more than 40% among one- and two-year-olds and service providers report record requests for service. However, in 2015 the community saw an increase in the number of children lead poisoned for the first time in more than two decades. Local partners are working with the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services as well as the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to identify the reason for the uptick. 2016 data is not yet available.

For more information on the GTLO! Coalition and the Healthy Homes Coalition, go to www.healthyhomescoalition.org.

Reduce Families in Poverty

The strategy to reduce families in poverty is primarily the work of the Kent County Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). It is the lead agency in the State's welfare to work initiative called Project Zero. This project is intended to bring welfare recipients into employment and, subsequently, independence from government assistance.

However, various community organizations share the responsibility of reducing poverty. The City's Community Development Department worked with DHHS through the Kent County Essential Needs Task Force with staff representatives serving on the housing committee and economic and workforce development committee. The Housing Continuum of Care also provides strategies for reducing poverty.

The City is limited in the amount of support it can provide for antipoverty efforts. This is primarily due to the restrictive use of funds for social service activities. However, the eight (8) outcomes of the Neighborhood Investment Plan support projects that benefit low- and moderate-income individuals. In particular, the outcomes *Increase opportunities for housing stability* and *Increase economic opportunities* support the anti-poverty strategy. The City also supports anti-poverty efforts through administration of its Section 3 Program, which provides employment and training preference to low-income persons and businesses that substantially employ low-income persons.

Institutional Structure

The City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department administers the funds used to carry out activities which support the HCD and Annual Plan objectives. Activities are implemented by City departments or through agreements with primarily non-profit organizations. A request for funding process occurs around January of each year. Emergency Solutions Grants funding awards are determined in coordination with the Housing Continuum of Care. A proposal review team led by the Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness develops funding recommendations consistent with the *Action Plan to End Homelessness* to be approved by the Grand Rapids City Commission.

The local governmental structure encourages citizen involvement and supports cooperative ventures. The HCD Plan is carried out through collaborations and partnerships with neighborhoods, businesses, investors, non-profit organizations, and private and public institutions. A detailed list is available in the HCD Plan at www.grcd.info.

Actions to Enhance Coordination between Public and Private Housing and Social Service Agencies.

Once a year, the City Commission holds a public hearing on general housing and community development needs within Grand Rapids. This hearing is held prior to the start of the annual funding process and allows for public input to the Annual Plan and the Five-Year HCD Plan (as applicable). In addition, the City may periodically seek input on housing and community development needs via other methods, including but not limited to surveys, outreach meetings, special study groups, and community reports and plans.

The City continued to initiate, facilitate and participate in coordination efforts between housing providers, social service agencies, and other local funders. Endeavors include those described in the Citizen Participation Plan as well as other collaboration and coordination opportunities, as necessary.

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing. The Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing is a requirement for CDBG program compliance (Section 570.904[c]). The purpose of the analysis is to determine the possible existence of impediments to fair housing choice based on race, religion, sex, color, national origin, disability, or familial status. According to the analysis, the following impediments exist:

- Inability to successfully prosecute violations of the local fair housing ordinance.
- Lack of education and awareness of fair housing laws.
- Language barriers for non-English speaking populations.
- Systemic barriers to fair housing choice.
- Limited supply of accessible housing.
- Funding for fair housing activities.

During the period of this report, the following actions were taken to address the identified impediments to fair housing choice:

- The City provided the Fair Housing Center of West Michigan (FHCWM) \$75,000 in CDBG funds to perform housing tests, investigate complaints of housing discrimination and provide educational and outreach activities.
- The FHCWM performed 56 tests to determine compliance with fair housing laws in the areas of sales, rental, insurance and financing. In 20 of these housing tests, evidence of discrimination was found and resolved in accordance with established criteria. The remaining 36 tests revealed no evidence of discrimination.
- The FHCWM trained 233 people in the real estate industry, 109 of whom reported they would modify their business practices as a result of the training.
- In November of 2016, in cooperation with City Development Center staff, Disability Advocates of Kent County (DAKC) facilitated a “lunch and learn” session on accessibility standards attended by approximately 25 contractors, architects, and other interested parties. DAKC provided the Development Center with a copy of the presentation and a Universal Design Architectural Standards guide for reference. The organization also provided brochures for distribution at the Development Center front counter.
- In April 2017, City staff attended an event that addressed topics related to fair housing. A total of five (5) staff attended workshops with four (4) staff attending a workshop entitled “Ensuring Fair Housing in Today’s Market,” and one (1) staff attending a “Putting Out the Welcome Mat for Seniors” workshop. Eight (8) staff attended a Fair Housing Luncheon. Both the workshop and the luncheon were facilitated by the FHCWM.

VII. Program Oversight and Monitoring

The following procedures are used by the City of Grand Rapids in on-site monitoring of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) program subrecipients. Monitoring procedures for entities receiving funding through the HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) are modeled after these procedures, but may differ based on the nature of the assisted project and the use of HOME funding. Some projects or uses of funds do not require on-site reviews (i.e. a property acquisition where the City has previously required full documentation prior to the disbursement of funds).

Monitoring of Federal Programs

The Community Development Department (CDD) monitors the City's performance in meeting goals and objectives set forth in the Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan. In particular, performance measurement indicators supporting outcomes under the Neighborhood Investment Plan are tracked. Results are reported in the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) due each September, 90 days from the start of the fiscal year (July 1).

Internal fiscal controls are in place and generate accounting system reports that are regularly reviewed by CDD staff. These reports identify the dollar amount allocated for each federal grant-funded activity, the amount obligated, and the amount expended. Timeliness of expenditures is monitored regularly to ensure compliance with HUD requirements.

CDD staff review all expenditures of federal grant funds for eligibility and adequate source documentation. All expenditures of federal funds, once approved by the CDD, are sent to the City's Comptroller's Office for processing and further oversight. A single audit of the City's federal grants is performed annually by an independent auditor. Additionally, a physical inventory of all fixed assets acquired with federal funds is conducted every two years.

Grantee (City) Project Monitoring Standards. The CDD monitors all activities using federal grant funds, including those implemented by the CDD and other City departments. Internal "contracts" called Intra- and Inter-Departmental Agreements are used to establish responsibilities and performance expectations. As with Subrecipient contracts, these agreements are monitored by CDD staff and performance data is tracked and reported in the CAPER.

Subrecipient Project Monitoring Standards. The CDD monitors all Subrecipient projects receiving Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program, Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG), and Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) funds. Subrecipients are certified annually including review of articles of incorporation, tax and insurance certifications, and bylaws. When an organization has expended more than \$750,000 in federal funds during a fiscal year, an agency single audit is required. Written agreements between the City and Subrecipients identify activities to be performed and measures of success, as well as specific federal and local program requirements.

Subrecipient Monitoring Procedures. Program/Project monitoring is comprised of three (3) components: financial reporting, performance reporting and on-site monitoring review.

- **Financial Reporting.** Financial reports are submitted on a monthly or quarterly basis. The financial reports provide information regarding actual program expenditures. These expenditures are reviewed by CDD staff to determine if the expenditures are within the approved budget, if they support contractual activities, and if costs are eligible.
- **Performance Reporting.** Performance reports are submitted to the CDD on an annual, semi-annual, or quarterly basis and are used to provide the CDD with a tool to measure a program's progress in providing contracted services.
- **On-Site Monitoring.** Staff conduct ongoing desk audits of subrecipient contract files. Annually, a determination is made whether an expanded monitoring review is necessary. This determination is based on prior findings that remain open, closed findings that need to be verified, outstanding independent audit, performance reporting issues, fiscal issues, and/or other appropriate areas that warrant additional monitoring. If it is determined that an expanded monitoring review is necessary, staff will conduct an on-site review. An on-site monitoring review may include examination of subrecipient programmatic records to validate information reported on performance and financial reports. A review of financial records may include an in-depth examination of invoices, time sheets and other documentation to support expenses charged to the contractual budget. Documentation for program activities is reviewed to corroborate performance reports and to verify that program activity costs allocated to the contractual budget are eligible.

After completing the on-site monitoring review, results are provided in writing to the Subrecipient within thirty (30) days. If concerns and/or findings are identified during the review, the monitoring letter will outline the identified issues and include recommendations and/or corrective actions for resolving issues. If there were no findings or concerns identified during the monitoring visit, the Subrecipient is provided with a letter stating such.

If concerns and/or findings are identified, the Subrecipient is instructed to submit a written response within thirty (30) days of the date of the City's monitoring letter. The response is reviewed by staff to determine if information submitted and/or actions taken are adequate to clear monitoring concerns and/or findings. Staff continues to work with the Subrecipient until all issues are resolved. At such time, the Subrecipient receives written notification that concerns or findings identified during the monitoring have been satisfied and the case is closed.

HOME Rental Project Monitoring. The HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program requires long-term monitoring of rental projects to ensure compliance with HOME regulations throughout the HOME affordability period. The period of affordability is between five (5) and twenty (20) years for most HOME rental projects. The primary factors used to determine the affordability period are the project type and the amount of HOME dollars invested in each unit.

Owners of HOME funded rental projects are required to submit an annual Tenant Income Rental Report (TIRR) to the Community Development Department. The TIRR is used to verify continued compliance with income limits and rent rates. HOME rental projects are also subject to on-site monitoring for the duration of the affordability period. Tenant files are reviewed during the monitoring session to confirm information reported in the TIRR and to ensure compliance with other HUD requirements. Tenants may also be interviewed during the monitoring session.

HOME rental projects also require on-going City inspections to ensure properties are in compliance with the City Property Maintenance Code. The frequency of inspections is determined by the number of HOME units in a project and the City's Property Maintenance Code mandated inspections.

Programmatic Agreement (Section 106) Monitoring. HUD has delegated responsibility to the City of Grand Rapids via programmatic agreements to act on their behalf as the responsible federal agency in the Section 106 process, which takes into consideration the effects of their undertaking on historic properties. The City has two (2) agreements with the Michigan State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). The General Programmatic Agreement was renewed June 29, 2012 and applies to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME), Emergency Shelter/Solutions Grants (ESG) programs, Neighborhood Stabilization Programs (NSP), and Special Purpose Grants for the following activities: residential and commercial rehabilitation, public improvements and infrastructure, handicapped accessibility, demolition, and new construction and additions. The Lead Programmatic Agreement applies to the Lead Hazard Control, Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), and HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) programs for lead hazard reduction activities (CDBG/HOME – emergency activities only).

The City prepares an annual report summarizing activities carried out pursuant to the terms of the Agreements. Copies of this report are provided to the SHPO, the National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and other parties that may so request.

Outreach to Racially and Ethnically Diverse (Minority) and Women Owned Businesses

To encourage use of minority and women's business enterprises invitation to submit Requests for Proposals for eligible HOME projects were published in local minority publications, in addition to the newspaper of general circulation.

All development agreements include a provision pertaining to the inclusion of small businesses. It is anticipated Assisted Entities will seek bids from and use where possible small businesses, including but not limited to, micro local business enterprises (Micro-LBE), veteran owned small businesses (VOSB), minority business enterprises (MBE), and women-owned business enterprises (WBE). A list of businesses certified as Micro-LBE and/or VOSB is available from the City's Office of Diversity and Inclusion. For construction projects, Assisted Entities provide information on the actual use of small businesses, as indicated above, on the Contractor and Subcontractor Activity Report submitted after completion of construction or rehabilitation of the property.

The City of Grand Rapids Office of Diversity and Inclusion provided outreach and took steps to engage in activities inclusive of all groups, including Racially and Ethnically Diverse Businesses (REDB, in lieu of MBE terminology), Women-Owned Business Enterprises (WBE), Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (VOSB), and other area disadvantaged small businesses. Following is a summary of actions taken between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017 to encourage participation of racially and ethnically diverse businesses and women-owned businesses in contracting opportunities.

- Continued oversight of Equal Business Opportunities (EBO) policies and guidelines established by the City Commission in 2004. These guidelines use an array of bid discounts that help create equity for small businesses bidding to the City.
- Continued the Micro-Local Business Enterprise program established in 2009. Micro-Local Business Enterprises now comprise 49% racially and ethnically diverse businesses and woman-owned businesses. Program elements that provide for discounted bids have been adopted and expanded by Grand Rapids Community College and Grand Rapids Public Schools.
- Continued to provide strategic guidance, networking opportunities, and construction bid information to the West Michigan Public Purchasing Alliance, Grand Rapids Chamber of Commerce/West Michigan Minority Contractors Association, the West Michigan Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, and the Grand Rapids Black Chamber of Commerce in the same manner as provided to all contractors.
- Made forecast information from City Departments to vendors, including REDBs, WBEs and VOSBs, and all others who requested it.
- Reviewed 37 construction bids. Thirty-two (32) of the bids had a total of 111 subcontracts. Eight (8) of the subcontracts were with REDBs and/or VOSBs. Three (3) prime contractors were VOSBs and one (1) MBE.

- Continued consultations with City buyers and City Departments on sole source and single source requests to ensure opportunities for all small businesses, including REDBs and WBEs, were not overlooked.
- Participated in the City/State’s reviews of new financial system development to ensure that opportunities to track special classes of businesses such as REDBs, WBEs, VOSBs, and Micro-LBEs are included and elements of the EBO programs can continue.
- Participated in all scheduled “Monday Group” meetings to help the West Michigan Minority Contractors Association and majority contractors develop value proposition to project owners and general contractors to increase minority participation on public and private sector construction projects. Emphasis was placed on identifying unused contractors and current contractor cash flow and bonding.
- Provided on-going consultative assistance to one Mentor-Protégé program participant, but continued to share the program with several potential relationships identified during the year.
- Provided general technical assistance to three (3) businesses, three (3) REDBs and eight (8) business-support or non-business entities.
- Made five (5) referrals to small business resource organizations.

Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises. The tables below identify the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period by MBEs/WBEs.

	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Contracts	3	0	0	0	0	3
Dollar Amount	\$386,313	0	0	0	0	\$383,913
Sub-Contracts	25	0	0	1	1	23
Dollar Amount	\$182,809	0	0	\$2,400	\$6,148	\$174,261

	Total	Women Business Enterprise	Male
Contracts	4	1	3
Dollar Amount	\$386,313	\$2,400	\$383,918
Sub-Contracts	24	0	24
Dollar Amount	\$180,409	0	\$180,409

Minority-Owned Rental Property. The table below identifies the number of and total amount of HOME funds invested in minority-owned rental properties assisted through the Rental Rehabilitation Program during the reporting period.

	Total	Minority Property Owners				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Contracts	1	0	0	0	0	1
Dollar Amount	\$8,213	0	0	0	0	\$8,213

Citizen Participation

Citizen Participation Plan. The Citizen Participation Plan describes the policies and procedures for involving citizens in critical planning issues related to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME), and Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) programs. The Citizen Participation Plan can be found in the Five-Year HCD Plan, the Annual Action Plan, and at www.grcd.info.

FFY 2016-2020 Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan. The FFY 2016-2020 Regional HCD Plan was developed by aligning community needs identified by citizens directly involved in various visioning and strategic planning processes. The Neighborhood Investment Plan focuses on eight (8) outcomes derived from the region's vision for neighborhoods.

FFY 2016 Annual Action Plan. The Housing and Community Development Annual Action Plan was made available for public comment from March 15, 2016 through April 15, 2016. The plan was available for review at the City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department offices and on the Community Development website. A summary of the Plan was also published in three (3) community newspapers: the Grand Rapids Press, the Grand Rapids Times, and El Vocero Hispano. Additionally, notices were mailed to organizations that applied for funding.

A public hearing was held on April 12, 2016. A summary of citizen comments can be found in the FFY 2016 Annual Action Plan. The Plan was adopted by the City Commission on May 10, 2016.

FFY 2016 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report. A public comment period for the purpose of receiving comment on the performance of housing and community development activities funded through the City of Grand Rapids for FFY 2016 was held from September 1, 2017 through September 15, 2017. Opportunity for public review and comment regarding the draft Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) was promoted through publication in The Grand Rapids Press. Notice was also provided to funded organizations. The draft report was available for review at the City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department office and on the Community Development Department web site (www.grcd.info).

A public hearing on the report was held before the City Commission on the evening of September 12, 2017. One organization representative spoke of the organization's partnership with the City to provide quality affordable housing. Three neighborhood association representatives spoke about their organization's accomplishments. One resident expressed concern neighborhood associations do not have enough freedom to assist persons they are trying to help, and one resident commented on the formatting of the draft CAPER document. In addition to comments received at the public hearing, three neighborhood associations provided written comment highlighting organization accomplishments and the importance of CDBG and JAG funds to support their work.

VIII. HOME Investment Partnerships Program Grants

Results of On-Site Inspections of Affordable Rental Housing

Rental Rehabilitation Program Compliance. During the reporting period, seven (7) Rental Rehabilitation Program units were inspected for compliance with applicable property standards by the Department's Code Compliance Division. All inspected units were certified as compliant.

Multi-family Rental Program Compliance. During the reporting period, seven (7) multi-family rental projects were inspected for compliance with applicable property standards by the Department's Code Compliance Division. All inspected units were certified as compliant. These include Herkimer-Commerce, ICCF NHC Lease/Purchase Program Rental Conversion, Carrier Crest Apartments, Madison Hall (Browning-Claytor) Town Homes, Grandville Homes, Ferguson Apartments and Oroquis Apartments.

Tenant Income Rent Reports (TIRR) and Affirmative Marketing Summary Reports, when applicable, were collected and reviewed by Community Development Department staff for all multi-family projects.

Affirmative Marketing Actions for HOME Units

During the period of this report, the Community Development Department carried out the following activities with respect to Affirmative Marketing Actions:

On an annual basis, the Community Development Department requests property owners that participate in the City's HOME Program notify the following organizations when they have housing units available: ACSET, Association for the Blind & Visually Impaired, Baxter Community Center, Fair Housing Center of West Michigan, Grand Rapids Housing Commission, Grand Rapids Urban League, Heart of West Michigan United Way, Hispanic Center of West Michigan, ACSET Michigan Works (Godfrey, SW Office), ASCET Michigan Works! (Franklin Office), Inter-Tribal Council of Grand Rapids, Inter-Tribal Council of Michigan (Sault Ste. Marie), ACSET Michigan Works! (Leonard, NE Office), ASCET Community Action Center (Southeast Complex), ACSET Community Action Center (West Side Complex), ASCET Community Action Center (Northeast Complex), Kent County Department of Human Services, The Salvation Army (Housing Hub) and Disability Advocates of Kent County.

During the current review period, the Community Development Department was responsible for monitoring Allen Manor Senior Housing Apartments, Alten Avenue Apartments, The Avenue Apartments, Bridge Street Place, Carmody Apartments, Carrier Crest Apartments, Division Park Avenue Apartments, Ferguson Apartments, Goodrich Apartments, Grandville Avenue Homes, Herkimer Commerce Apartments, Heron Court Apartments, Heron Manor Apartments, Kelsey Apartments, Madison Avenue Apartments, Madison Hall Townhomes, Martineau Apartments, New Hope Homes, Oroquis Apartments, Roosevelt Park Lofts, Scattered Site Rentals, Serrano Lofts, Southtown Square II, and Verne Barry Place. All of the above projects were found to be in compliance with the City's affirmative marketing requirements.

Amount and use of program income for projects, including the number of projects and owner/tenant characteristics.

The City did not use program income to fund HOME-assisted projects during the reporting period.

Other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing.

The City is committed to maintaining the existing affordable housing stock for low- and moderate-income persons and to expanding the supply of affordable housing. These efforts include the implementation of activities to acquire and rehabilitate foreclosed, abandoned and blighted properties using federal funds. Monitoring activities to ensure program compliance of City-assisted affordable housing projects will continue. A number of activities undertaken during the reporting period maintain and increase the supply of affordable housing.

Allocation of HOME Funds and HOME Accomplishments

During FFY 2016, HOME funds were used to support the Neighborhood Investment Plan outcome to increase affordable and high quality housing.

FFY 2016 HOME			
Allocations, Objectives Addressed and Population Groups Assisted			
Outcome 2: Increase Affordable and High Quality Housing			
<i>Organization: Program/Project</i>	<i>Objective</i>	<i>Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Funding</i>
<i>LINC Community Revitalization</i> Eastern Village, New Construction, Multi-family	New construction of a 72 unit to create affordable rental units for low-income families.	Low-Income Households	\$250,000
<i>New Development Corporation</i> North End Affordable Housing/ADR	Substantial redevelopment of a single-family structure to create an affordable housing unit for sale to one (1) low-income households.	Low-Income Households	\$90,000
<i>The Salvation Army Social Services</i> Short-Term Rental Assistance	Households serviced with Short-Term Rental Assistance for up to six (6) months.	Low-Income Households	\$378,973

In addition to the project funding shown above, \$25,000 in Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) operating support was provided to New Development Corporation to support the implementation of HOME-assisted activities.

FFY 2016 HOME Accomplishments as of June 30, 2017	
Project	Assessment
<i>LINC Community Revitalization</i> Eastown Village, Multi-Family Rental Units	This project did not move forward. Funds awarded to the project were reallocated as part of the FFY 2017 Annual Action Plan.
<i>New Development Corporation</i> North End Affordable Housing/ADR	One (1) property was acquired during the reporting period. Construction and sale is anticipated to occur during the FFY 2017 reporting period.
<i>The Salvation Army Social Services</i> Short-Term Rental Assistance	A total of 93 households received short-term rental assistance during the reporting period. 72 of those households were served with FFY 2016 funds and 21 were served with FFY 2015 funds. Additional households will be served with FFY 2016 funds from July 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017.

During the reporting period, progress was made on special projects funded with HOME funding from previous fiscal years.

- ICCF Nonprofit Housing Corporation** – The City has provided up to \$180,000 in FFY 2014 HOME funds to ICCF Nonprofit Housing Corporation to acquire, rehabilitate and sell two (2) existing single-family home located in the Community Development General Target Area. The project located at 1134 Prospect Avenue SE, was sold to an income-eligible household during the reporting period. The remaining unit, 841 Lafayette Avenue, SE, is under construction and will be sold to an income-eligible household during the next report period.

The City also provided \$300,000 in FFY 2015 HOME funds to the 435 LaGrave Limited Dividend Housing Association Limited Partnership to develop 24 affordable rental units in the Southtown Specific Target Area (STA). Construction is underway with project completion scheduled for the fall of 2017.

- New Development Corporation** – The City provided up to \$180,000 in FFY 2013 funds to New Development Corporation to acquire, rehabilitate and sell two (2) existing single-family homes located within the Belknap, Creston, and Stocking target areas. The remaining unit, located at 814 Seventh Street, NW, was sold to an income-eligible during the reporting period.

The City also provided up to \$180,000 in FFY 2014 funds to New Development Corporation to acquire, rehabilitate and sell two (2) existing single-family homes located within the Belknap, Creston, and Stocking target areas. The remaining unit, located at 1231 Hamilton Avenue, NW, was sold to an income-eligible household during the reporting period.

Dwelling Place of Grand Rapids Nonprofit Housing Corporation – The City provided up to \$300,000 in FFY 2015 funds to Dwelling Place of Grand Rapids Nonprofit Housing Corporation to own and rehabilitate 43 existing multi-family rental units in four (4) properties, and own and develop six (6) multi-family rental units for occupancy by income-eligible households. As of June 30, 2017, construction is nearing completion. Full project completion, final payment, and final closeout are anticipated to occur in the next reporting period.

- **City of Grand Rapids Community Development Department** – During the period of this report, three (3) units were completed under the Rental Rehabilitation Program.